UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,158	08/25/2003	Kenneth MC Cheung	UHK-118XT	3550
	7590 09/22/200 K LLOYD & SALIW	EXAMINER		
A PROFESSIO	NAL ASSOCIATION	SHAFFER, RICHARD R		
PO BOX 142950 GAINESVILLE, FL 32614-2950			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3733	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/22/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/648,158	CHEUNG ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Richard Shaffer	3733		

	Richard Shaffer	3733	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 29 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS AF	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extrunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS 	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	sideration and/or search (see NOTw); er form for appeal by materially red	TE below); ducing or simplifying the	
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.12) The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 	16 and 41.33(a)). 1. See attached Notice of Non-Co		PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	•	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 20-22,28,29 and 32-46. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
 REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Eduardo C. Robert/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3733	/Richard Shaffer/ Examiner, Art Unit 3733		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments to claim 46 add limitations not previously considered therefore requiring additional search and/or consideration.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant initially points out that Cool discloses a transition temperature below "the body temperature" which refers to the body temperature of the subject. In the claims however, applicant merely states that the material is superelastic at the body tempture fo the patient and that the material has a transition temperature "within the range of body temperature," not necessarily that of the patient. Therefore, other animals could be considered which have a variety of temperatures, also cadavers of humans could be a possibility, or hypo-thermic humans could be a possibility. Therefore, the statement that the transisition temperature is within the range of body temperature is rather broad and open to various interpretations. This response holds for applicant's arguments against Drewry stating that the transition temperature was not even addressed, however as pointed out previously, superelastic nitinol was considered as the usable material. It is not persuasive given applicant's statements attempting to decouple the relationship of superelastic nitinol providing the elasticity desired in the device. Finally, with regard to the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection over Sanders et al and Cool et al, while Sanders et al taught the benefits of using post-heating to induce the correction force, the acknowledgement that it was done previously all at once along with the teaching of Cool et al being activated by body heat and stating an additional prior art device utitized a transition temperature with body temperature given as an example demonstrate that it is not the only way applying a corrective force. Therefore, the combination of Sanders et al and Cool et al do not teach away from the disclosure of Sanders et al to the effect of providing a spinal correction force, perhaps less preferred, but still completely functional as well as evidenced as being done previously.